



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/615,732	07/08/2003	Glen Keith Russell	4164-307	1813

7590 09/08/2004

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
1030 S.W. Morrison Street
Portland, OR 97205

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, KIM T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3713

DATE MAILED: 09/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/615,732

Applicant(s)

RUSSELL ET AL.

Examiner

Kim Nguyen

Art Unit

3713

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE ____ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/8/03, 2/10/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 3-8, and 12-13 are objected to because of the following informalities:
 - a) In claim 3, line 1; claim 4, line 1; claim 12, line 1; and claim 13, line 1, the claimed limitation “at least two gaming components” should be corrected to “said at least two gaming components”.
 - b) In claim 3, line 2; and claim 13, lines 2-3, the claimed limitation “without the game processing unit” should be corrected to “without being processed or transmitted by the game processing unit”.
 - c) In claim 5, line 1; claim 6, line 1, the claimed limitation “the link” should be corrected to “wherein the link”.
 - d) In claim 6, line 2, the claimed limitation “a game processing unit” should be corrected to “the game processing unit”.
 - e) In claim 7, line 2; claim 8, lines 1-2, the claimed limitation “gaming components” should be corrected to “the gaming components”.
 - f) In claim 7, line 3, the claimed limitation “components” should be corrected to “the gaming components”.
 - g) In claim 12, line 2, the claimed limitation “a cabinet” should be corrected to “the cabinet”.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 7 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

a) In claim 7, line 2 and line 3, the claimed limitation “one link” is ambiguous. It is not clear if the “one link” refers to the “communication link” in claim 1, line 5, or the “second communication link” in claim 7, lines 1-2.

b) In claim 16, line 1, the claimed limitation “the remote communication link” lacks of antecedent basis. Further, the use of the word “further” in line 1 is not accurate because the remote communication link has not had any functionality disclosed yet.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-6, and 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Charrin (US 2003/0014370).

- a) As per claim 1 and 3, Charrin discloses a gaming system comprising two gaming components 202 and 204 (Fig. 2); each gaming component comprises a controller 210, 230 (Fig. 2), a communication interface 212, 232 (Fig. 2), and a communication link 203 (Fig. 2). Charrin does not explicitly disclose allowing the controllers of the gaming components to communicate peer to peer with other controllers of other gaming components. However, Charrin discloses the capability of transferring data between the components (paragraph 0042). Further, allowing a communication on a peer-to-peer basis on different modules would have been well known to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow communication between controllers of Charrin on a peer-to-peer basis in order to facilitate direct communication between controllers.
- b. As per claim 2, Charrin discloses a game processing unit 208 (Fig. 2) (paragraph 0036).
- c. As per claim 4, Charrin discloses a bill validator 204 (Fig. 2), and a card reader 202 (Fig. 2).
- d. As per claim 5-6, Charrin discloses a link for transferring data between the bill acceptor 204 (Fig. 2) and the card reader 202 (Fig. 2) (paragraph 0042).
- e. As per claim 8-9, adding or removing a component while power is on; and providing power to a game component would have been well known to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3713

6. Claims 7 and 10-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Charrin (US 2003/0014370) in view of Stockdale et al (US 2002/0187830).

a. As per claim 7, Stockdale discloses a second communication link for communication between the components in the cabinet and components outside the cabinet (Fig. 2). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a second link for connecting the components in the game machine of Charrin to an outside component in order to facilitate communication between different gaming system.

b. As per claim 10, Stockdale discloses using IEEE 1394 link (paragraph 0049).

c. As per claim 11, refer to discussion in claims 1 and 7 above. Further, using a well known bridge for connecting different system together would have been well known.

d. As per claim 12-16, refer to discussion in claim 2-3 and 9-10 above. Further, implementing a link as a backplane communication bus or cabled communication bus, or providing power to an external device would have been well known.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kim Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 308-7915. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30AM to 5:00PM ET.

The central official fax number is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1148.

kn

Date: September 3, 20004


KIM NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER